

At local meeting March 15, 1918.

THE BULLETIN

OF THE

PEOPLE'S COUNCIL OF AMERICA

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1918

EDITORIAL BUSINESS OFFICES:
138 WEST 13th STREET, NEW YORK CITY

Maurer To Go To Europe For Radicals

James H. Maurer, president of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, Socialist and labor's spokesman on the floor of the Pennsylvania State Assembly, is going to Europe as the representative of American Radicalism.

He was drafted for that purpose by a national conference of representatives and members of Labor, Socialist and other Radical movements, held in New York February 16 and 17. Passports were at once applied for and the delegate of American Radicalism may be on his way to England, France and Italy by the time this appears in print.

The conference was made up of delegates from 31 labor bodies, some of them international unions, 34 Socialist bodies, 56 radical bodies, among them many local People's Councils, and 10 liberal bodies, among them several church organizations. Some fifty of the members of the conference came as individuals. Owing to the fact that many organizations did not have time to meet and select delegates between the time that the hurried call was issued and the date of the conference, the conference was much

smaller than it otherwise would have been. Twenty-seven states, among them California and Washington, were represented.

Instructions to Delegate Maurer were included in a "constructive program for democracy and peace" adopted by the conference. This program was almost exactly in line with that of the proletarian regime of Russia and with the views of the British labor movement as expressed in the address of that movement to the Russian people some weeks ago. The program and resolutions are published elsewhere in this issue.

No action upon the part of American radicals since the war began has received so much attention upon the part of the larger newspapers of the country, if we except the meeting of the People's Council in Chicago in September. So much importance was attached to the meeting by the reactionary press, by the servants of Big Business and by the reactionary elements of labor organizations that vigorous efforts were made to prevent the meeting.

Failing to prevent it, these elements united to create the impression that an American delegate would not be welcome to an Inter-Allied Socialist and Labor conference proposed for London in the near future. No such conference would be held, it was asserted by a so-called British labor delegation in the United States at the time. Whether

such a conference is to be held would make little difference, as Chairman Nearing pointed out at the first session. What was wanted was an ambassador of the American proletariat to the workingmen of England, France and Italy. The chief function of that ambassador will be to visit those countries, tell workingmen and other radicals there of the radical movement in America, and bring home the exact, first-hand truth about the convictions and the purposes of our fellows in the Entente countries.

Just for good measure, however, Chairman Nearing read newspaper articles showing that the Socialist and Labor forces of the Allied countries were planning such a conference and that they had tried to get an American delegation. Dr. Judah L. Magnes still further clinched the argument by reading several excerpts from articles in the Manchester (England) *Guardian*, telling of plans for the conference and the wish of English labor to have American representatives present.

Upon the return of Mr. Maurer it is planned to arrange a countrywide speaking tour for him, to begin with a great mass meeting in Madison Square Garden, New York City. This speaking tour will constitute the delegate's report to the people of the United States.

SCOTT NEARING SOUNDS THE KEYNOTE

Scott Nearing, chairman of the executive committee of the People's Council of America, presided at the first session of the conference in Bryant Hall, Saturday, February 16. His opening address was the keynote of the conference. The main parts of his speech follow:

It is now eleven months since the Russian people asserted their popular rights as against the dynastic rights of the Romanoff family, and during those eleven months we have made some impressive strides in the direc-

tion of world peace and democracy. The currents that we have today in the world are, roughly, two. On the one hand there are the people who want peace; on the other hand there are the people who want the war to go on. And as we look the situation over, we find among the people who want a peace, foremost in their contribution toward peace, the Russian revolutionists, and then the Labor Party in England, the radical parties in France and Italy, and then certain of the diplomats, such as President Wilson, Lord

Lansdowne, and the like. On the other side, among the people who want the war to continue, we find prominent certain of the business interests, and then a large section of the diplomatic group—von Hertling, apparently, in Germany; Lloyd George, probably, in England; Clemenceau in France, and a large contingent in this country. So far as we can see, none of the peoples of the warring nations are anxious to have the war go on. So far as we can see, the sentiment, as it has been expressed among the peoples of the warring na-

tions, is a sentiment in favor of steps—whether an armistice or an immediate peace conference, or whatever other steps need be taken—to bring about a cessation of hostilities, an end of the war, and a permanent democratic peace.

Under these circumstances, a number of us decided that the time had come for the American people, or at least such a section of the American people as seem to be interested in this general proposition, to get together and talk the thing over.

When the war broke out in Europe, we Americans were relying upon institutions and upon individuals to preserve and maintain our liberties. We had forgotten that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We had ceased to be vigilant. We had quite lost interest in liberty. I say very frankly to you that I, for one, did not believe the issue of liberty was an issue until about five years ago. I had been taught in the schools to believe, and I had been believing, that the issue of liberty was not an issue in America, because it had been settled. The Statue of Liberty stood down there in the harbor. The Constitution safeguarded us. Our state laws and constitutions, and all the paraphernalia of our government preserved our liberty and protected us against any assault upon them. That, I take it, was the frame of the American mind when the war broke in 1914.

Our "Economic Rights"

For more than a century we have depended upon the private ownership of economic opportunities to preserve economic rights. The laissez-faire, or Manchester school of economists, prevailed upon us to believe that if we gave free land ownership, we would have economic rights. All we had to do was to open up the land. Let people go and take it, and, as one of them said, "If you give a man a lease on a garden, he will turn it into a desert. If you give him a fee-simple of a barren rock, he will convert it into a garden." That was the principle upon which we established our individual ownership of resources, of transportation agencies, of financial agencies, of productive agencies, in every direction.

Now we have had a century of experience with depending upon private property in economic opportunity as an institution to preserve economic rights. What is the result? In the first place, a tiny fraction of the people has concentrated in its hands all of the important economic opportunities in the country. Franchises, public utilities, resources, coal, iron, timber, and the like, industrial concerns, financial agencies—all of the important economic opportunities are concentrated in the hands of a tiny fraction of the population, and they are the special privileged minority, which exploits and robs quite indiscriminately, and quite legally, the worker on the one hand and the consumer on the other. We have ample evidence in regard to the exploitation of the worker. We don't need to go into that. We have ample evidence, and have had considerable additional evidence this winter with regard to the exploitation of the consumer.

We have got the monopoly profit, or robbery, whichever way you choose to put it, as a matter of course in American life, so that on the one hand we are the richest nation on earth, and on the other hand we have thirty million children living in poverty. On the one hand we have seventeen thousand individuals with an aggregate income of two billions and a half a year, and we have about six or seven million families with income averaging less than six hundred dollars a year. With an annual income that would permit every family in the United States to have at least fifty dollars a week, if it were equally divided up, we have three-fourths of our families receiving less than fifty dollars a week, and a very tiny fraction of it receiving huge additions to fifty dollars a week. In other words, the system of economic opportunities through private ownership, which was to preserve economic rights, has built up one of the most admirable and complete systems of economic exploitation that the world has ever seen. If we will give it just twenty-five years more uninterrupted chance to proceed, I think that it will beat anything to a frazzle that the world has produced heretofore. I don't think even Roman imperialism or mediaeval feudalism will be in the same class with American industrialism, if it has one more generation to perfect its economic system.

Second, we have in the hands of this minority—this economic special privileged class—all of the social surplus. They control the surplus wealth. When you put a dollar into the savings bank, they get control of it. When you put a dollar into an insurance policy, they get control of it. When they get their huge returns in interest and dividends and profits, they have the control of it. The individual depositor, the individual policyholder, the individual worker lives from hand to mouth.

The Social Surplus

The tiny fraction of economically special privileged people hold the economic surplus, which gives them a substantial control over the community. By means of that economic control, they control the press, they own the press. They control the churches, they control the educational machinery of the country—in schools and universities. They control all of the theatres, moving-picture business, and the like. All of the machinery for public opinion is in their hands, so that they have not only the economic machinery, they have the machinery of public opinion as well. That control has given them a control over the political machinery of the country.

Now, I realize that at this point I may be treading on very dangerous ground, and so I propose to quote to you what should be unassailable evidence. I want to quote to you the words of a prominent historian and political scientist in regard to this point. He says, "The masters of the government of the United States are the combined capitalists and manufacturers of the United States. The government of the United States at the present time is a foster child of the special inter-

ests." Further, he says, "This has gone so far that an invisible empire has been set above the forms of democracy."

You will find those statements in the "New Freedom," pages 57, 58 and 35. (Laughter and applause.) In other words, President Wilson has put the thing in a way which is authoritative, because he is an authority on that subject, and in a way which is inimitable, as most of his language is inimitable, clear and concise. "The masters of the Government of the United States are the combined capitalists and manufacturers. We have erected," he says, "an invisible empire on the forms of democracy."

Now, that is what has happened to us who depended upon private ownership as an institution to preserve economic liberty. We tried it. We have given it 150 years, and it has turned out the kind of a dismal failure which Mr. Wilson's words indicate. A little fraction of the population has the economic opportunities, the control of public opinion, and the substantial control of government all in its own hands. That is one experience which in itself should have taught us not to put our trust in an institution for the preservation of liberty, because an institution is a weapon that the privileged have always used to perpetuate their privilege.

"Constitutional Rights"

Take another case. We have told one another during these years, with child-like faith and simplicity, that the constitution would preserve our civil rights. Economic rights were not safeguarded under the constitution, but at least the constitution, a written instrument of government, would preserve our civil rights. Now we have certain government reports with regard to Ludlow, by the United States Commission on Industrial Relations; with regard to the deportations at Bisbee, by a special commission appointed by President Wilson; with regard to the Mooney frame-up in San Francisco, by a special commission appointed by President Wilson (applause) and in all of these cases from unimpeachable governmental authority, we are told that the economic machine in Ludlow, in Bisbee, in San Francisco—that the economic machinery is so powerful, as Mr. Wilson indicates, that you cannot have any civil liberties without their O. K.

Take any of these reports, and you will find that that is the sum of the report—that these acts were without justification in law, but that they were performed because the economic special privileged minority wanted them to be performed.

The constitution guarantees us the right of free speech and free assembly. Last fall a group of us tried to gather in Minneapolis, tried to gather in Wisconsin, tried to gather in Chicago. We telegraphed to the President, we appealed to the Secretary of War to furnish us protection. Our answer was the answer from the Governor of Illinois, who called out six thousand troops to chase out our crowd and disperse the assemblage. We had not said

(Continued on Page 4 and 5)

A CALL TO ACTION

To Our Members and Affiliated Bodies:

Through President Wilson, the American people have been pledged before the world to "*Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.*"

If this war has any significance at all, it lies in the fact that the peoples of all nations want to see an end put once and forever to militarism.

Yet what is the situation in Washington to-day? Instead of backing the President and the Secretary of War in giving "adequate guarantees . . . that national armament will be reduced," lobbyists of Big Business, profiteers and other sham patriots are busy day and night to put over Universal Military Training.

What is Universal Military Training? It is Prussianism, pure and simple. The enslavement of labor, the tightening of capitalism's grip, the denial of individual right, the suppression of personality—all that is comprehended under that term.

For America to adopt universal conscription as a national policy would be giving the lie to our much heralded purpose of "making the world safe for democracy."

How can we expect any nation to believe us hereafter, if we shout for the dethronement of Prussian militarism on the one hand and at the same time build up the largest American military establishment ever known?

Act *today*. Write your Congressman and Senator *today*. Arrange for a protest mass meeting *today*. Get your labor union started *today*.

Our Washington representative tells us that the bill for Universal Military Training will pass unless we wake up.

WHAT WILL YOU DO?

LOUIS P. LOCHNER,
Executive Secretary,
People's Council of America.

BEAT PRUSSIANISM AT HOME

BY ISAAC McBRIDE

Washington Representative of the People's Council

Universal military training must be defeated. The bill is now pending before the Military Affairs Committee of both houses of Congress. It provides that all males between the ages of 18 and 21 shall undergo military training and thereafter to become part of a reserve army.

The Secretary of War has gone on record against it. The President, it is understood, is opposed to it. And we have a goodly number of Senators and Congressmen with us in our fight to prevent its passage.

The militarists of this country backed by Big Business are doing everything they can to secure this law. They are well organized and are spreading their propaganda far and wide.

Universal military training is a high sounding phrase to those who desire to turn the United States into an armed camp—they insist that it is the essence of Democracy. They do not say, however, that it is the democracy that enslaves, that protects the despoilers of labor, that fosters hatred, destroys individuality, crushes the finer human instincts and blots out the spirit of brotherhood, neither do they tell us that its final result is the arraignment of the workers of the world against each other on battlefields to maim and kill like wild beasts in the jungle.

Let us not be deceived. You cannot destroy militarism by encouraging the spirit of militarism. Germany, France, Russia, in the past resorted to the training of their youth in the school of militarism and the world is now a slaughter house. Shall we draw any lesson from this fact? Shall we prepare for the next war or shall we strive for a lasting peace?

The world is moving rapidly. The workers can determine whether it shall move backward or forward. *We must stand up NOW and protest vigorously against the bill for universal military training, and prevent this additional weapon of tyranny from passing into the hands of the Profiteers.*

These are days that call for the united action of the liberty loving people of this country if we are to prevent a repetition of the international butchery that has been going on for almost four years.

Right now is the time to protest against this bill. Hold public meetings, acquaint the people with the fact that this law is contemplated. Write your Senators and Representatives a *personal* letter telling them how you feel on this matter.

Don't delay making your protest. Delay means defeat. *Now is the time to act!*

SCOTT NEARING SOUNDS THE KEYNOTE

(Continued from Page 2)

anything. We had not done anything that violated even the spirit of the constitution, let alone the letter, but because they did not like what we were supposed to be going to say we were denied the right of free assemblage in most barefaced manner, so that there is no question as to whether we have the right of free assemblage or not. We had not it in September, 1917. Things have happened since then, of course, that make it a little different.

We have now the right of free assemblage again, but the same old constitution was on the job last September that is on the job now (laughter), and we noticed in the papers last night that the Non-Partisan League, in one county in Minnesota, has been refused permission to hold any meetings because of a certain statement that the president of the league uttered last summer. (Laughter.)

So, as I say, the guarantee in the constitution with regard to freedom of speech and of assemblage has proved utterly impotent as a protection to free speech and free assemblage. We might as well recognize the fact. We might as well say to ourselves, "You silly, childish, foolish people have been deluding yourselves to believe that you had free speech and free assemblage. You have not had it all along, but you did not know it. When it came to the test, you found that you had not free speech and free assemblage, whether it was in the constitution or no."

Submerging Freedom

In exactly the same way, free press has been submerged under the Espionage law, and the Trading with the Enemy law. We have no longer a free press in America. Mr. Burleson can practically put the press out of business, under these two acts of Congress. Now, note that the constitution says, "Congress shall make no law restricting the freedom of speech or of the press." I am not a lawyer, so I don't know what that means. (Laughter and applause.) But it sounds to me as if it meant that Congress shall make no law restricting the freedom of speech and of the press—a perfectly unequivocal, plain statement. Congress passed two laws, the Espionage act and the Trading with the Enemy Act, and under those two laws they have put, I think, twenty-five newspapers practically out of business. And think of this!—think of this—that the editors of one of those papers are under indictment, subject to a penalty of \$10,000 fine and twenty years in jail, for publishing cartoons and writing articles.

We have got that far. No longer freedom of the press! The man who attempts to exercise that freedom put under indictment for doing it! The I. W. W. leaders—one hundred and sixty-six of them, I think, indicted in Chicago, and in jail! Why? For industrial agitation! The life of the worker depends upon his right to agitate in-

dustrially. These men, charged with taking German money, charged with all kinds of scandalous things, and so far there has not been a scintilla of evidence produced to show that they did anything except to agitate industrially. But they agitated industrially, and are now under indictment.

In other words, here we have our rights, freedom of assemblage, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to agitate—which is the sum of all those things—completely swept aside.

Furthermore, we have leading editors, publishers and business men openly advocating and practicing mob violence—in the papers, in public, and getting away with it, without prosecution from the authorities.

All of this time lawyers and judges have said to me personally, very frankly, "We cannot enforce the law now. The constitution cannot be enforced now. The necessities of war make that impossible." Now that may or may not be true. I don't care whether that is true or not. Suppose that it is true. *Then we reach inevitably the conclusion that in a great public crisis the constitution may be swept aside. If it may be swept aside in a public crisis, why, then, it is not a guarantee of liberties in a public crisis. Now, we will remember this, that in a crisis the constitution may be swept aside. We will remember this—all the time bearing in mind the fact that when a crisis arises we cannot depend upon the constitution to guarantee our civil liberties.*

With pathetic eagerness, the American people returned the Democratic administration to power because it had kept us out of war. (Laughter.) A month, almost to the day, after the Democratic administration went back into power we were in the war. We relied on private property. We relied on the constitution. We relied on an administration to safeguard our liberties—economic, political, civil. We went to a stone quarry looking for bread, and we got just what we deserved—stones! (Laughter and applause.)

We were not intelligent about it. We did not act like grown-up folk. We relied on something outside of ourselves to preserve our liberties. We thought somebody else was going to do it for us. We thought some machinery could be created by which liberty would be maintained. We thought we could quit on the job, and go about making a living, or doing something else except preserving liberties, and here we come up with a round turn, to find that our liberties were not preserved by private property, by the constitution, or by any other artificial outside thing; and if this crisis has taught us nothing else, I hope that we have learned that much.

The Russian Way

Now let us turn for a moment to the people whose experience has been diametrically opposite. I am referring now to the Russian people. (Loud and prolonged applause.) I hope the Russian people realize how much we think of them. (Laughter and applause.) I wonder if they are applauding that way now for us. (Laughter.) The Russian

people, more than any other people, in this great crisis have showed us the way by relying on themselves. They overthrew the old shibboleths. They put aside the old institutions, and listen to this tribute to them: "Their voice is more thrilling and more compelling than any of the moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. Their soul is not subservient."

Let us read that again—"Their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conviction of what is right, of what is humane, and honorable for them to accept has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind." That is Mr. Wilson's tribute to the Russian people on the eighth of January.

They are relying on themselves. Do you suppose it was a small thing for the Russian people to fly in the face of the empire? Do you suppose it was a small thing for them to take their patriotism and throw it away? Do you suppose it was a small thing for the Russian people to ignore the church—that great traditional institution that has held them in subjection through the centuries? Do you suppose it was a small thing for the Russian people to tear through these old things that grip them as tightly and more tightly than any of the old things grip us? Do you suppose that was a small thing?

It looks small at a distance of four or five thousand miles, but the grip of patriotism and religion was as tight, or tighter, in Russia, than it is among many of us in many parts of this country. They have had these institutions longer than we have had them. Yes, and they have been taught to venerate them more consistently than we have been taught to venerate ours. But when they came to the crisis, they decided to reject the institution and preserve liberty. (Applause.)

Now, notice the way Mr. Wilson puts that. He says, "Their conviction of what is right, of what is humane and honorable, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, and a generosity of spirit—a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind." See, because they tore away from the institutions, because they did not say, "What would the Church have us do?" or "What would the Czar have us do?"—because they said, "This is my conviction of what is right and just and honorable"—because of that reason their voice is more compelling and more thrilling than any of the voices that are moving at this time—(applause)—because they had the nerve to rely on themselves, and their firm sense of justice and truth, rather than the sense of the church, or the state, or any other establishment and traditional institution. Therefore, they stand out as probably the greatest movement—their step the greatest step since the American Revolution. They stand out as one of the most distinctive pages, on one of the most distinctive pages of all history, because for the first time the working

people, the common people, who do not do anything else except keep the world going (Laughter)—for the first time these common working people have dispensed with their overlords, dispensed with their institutions, and tried to run things on their own initiative—tried to do it themselves.

"The Russian people," Mr. Wilson says the voice is the voice of the Russian people—not the Russian government. The voices of governments only sound through megaphones. (Laughter and applause.) It is not the voice of the government. That means diplomacy. That means artificiality. That means machinery. That is not the voice of the government—that is the voice of the Russian people (Applause)—"more thrilling and more compelling." (Applause.)

Emphasizing a Contrast

I would like to make that contrast so clear that people would get it—that it is we who have stuck in the mud, and they who have gotten out on the highways of democratic progress. That is the contrast I want to get. (Applause.) They have had the nerve to stand for their convictions of what was right and just. They sought for liberty in their own hearts, and that is the only place where liberty ever lives. (Applause.) No matter what the character of the institution, if people don't have liberty in their hearts they will have no liberty in their communities. It is because, as Mr. Wilson points out here, because they have it in their hearts, because it is their conviction, "their voice is so thrilling and so compelling," and that is the contrast that we have got to see between America and Russia, between our problem and their problem, that they are speaking the convictions of their hearts. Now, what has that meant—this dominance for the moment of the common people?

I don't care whether the Bolsheviks succeed or fail—that has nothing to do with the argument. I am not saying that they will last after tomorrow. I don't know. But I do say this—that for those months we have had the voice of the common people sounded. And what has the voice of the common people done? It may be crushed out—may be silenced for another century or two. Understand that has got nothing to do with the case. But when they did get a chance to speak, what did they say? Why, in the first place they have confounded militarism. (Applause.) We, the Allied countries, are opposed to militarism—so are the Russians. We have been trying for three years to overthrow militarism. We have not made very rapid progress. The Russians have been trying it for only a few months, and they have made the most astounding strides. As Professor Gilbert Murray said the other day in a signed article: Trotsky proposes peace to his enemies on terms of absolute justice and equality." Mr. Lloyd George says, "We cannot talk peace to the Germans until we have licked them." (Laughter.) Now, Trotsky proposes a peace of democracy, justice and equality. They, of course, mock at him. You know, when they

went back to Germany with the proposals, people rose all over Germany and said, "We won't stand for this thing." The Annexationist party tried to hold meetings and the people would not let them hold meetings in Germany.

They said, "We won't stand for this annexation policy." How did it get out? It got out because Trotsky just blurted it out. He is not a diplomat. He is not accustomed to the official lying policy of diplomacy. He is just an ordinary man, and when he wants to say a thing he says it. The German diplomats came with their proposals, and the Russians published them, and it did more damage to the supremacy of the annexation policy in Germany than anything that has happened so far. (Laughter.)

The Russians are threatening the foundations of imperialism. Now, please note this. Imperialism has nothing to fear from the triumph of Great Britain. Great Britain is the greatest empire in the world. If you don't believe that, read King George's speech at the assembly of Parliament. (Laughter.) He says, "We are in this war for democracy," and then he says "The British Empire" in the next line. Then he goes on to say, "My navy—my army—I and my allies." Now, he is in the war for democracy, but he represents an empire. Imperialism has nothing to fear from the triumph of Britain, nor from the triumph of Germany, because while Germany has not got as much of the world as Britain, she would like to have it. (Laughter.) But if the Bolsheviks triumph imperialism is doomed. (Applause.)

Blurted the Truth

The Russians come out with their "no annexations, no indemnities—no compulsory annexations, no compulsory indemnities, the free development of all the people, self-determination." Part of Russia wants self-determination. They say, "All right, go ahead, determine it. You are right. You are right." They are willing to live up to it.

They are willing to tell the truth. So they published the secret treaties. (Applause.) Now, some of you have believed—some people still believe that this war is a great contest over certain ethical principles, certain ephemeral things, non-changeable things. Under those circumstances, it becomes extremely interesting to read these secret treaties—the treaty, for example, between Italy, France, Russia and England, by which Italy entered the war. Italy specifies that she shall receive Trentino, that she shall receive Dalmatia, that she shall receive certain other territories. Then that "France, Great Britain and Russia in principle recognize the interests of Italy, in preserving the political balance in the Mediterranean Sea, and her right to receive on the division of Turkey an equal share with them in the basin of the Mediterranean, and more specifically in that part of it contiguous to the province of Adalia, where Italy had already obtained special rights and has developed certain interests vouchsafed to her by the Italo-British agreement, etc."—dividing up the Mediterranean basin.

Then she goes on in Article XIII—in the event of expansion of French and English colonial domains, Italy is to get her share there, and they divide up Africa. Then the next article states, "England obligates herself to assist Italy immediately to negotiate on the London market on advantageous terms a loan in a sum not less than 50,000,000 pounds sterling." Two weeks after that treaty was signed by Grey, by Imperiali, Cambon and Benckendorf, Italy entered the war for those specific economic considerations, detailed in sixteen separate articles.

Then here is our old friend Alsace and Lorraine. (Laughter.) We have an immense sentimental interest in Alsace and Lorraine. Here is the way the Frenchmen feel about it. Note from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of February 14, 1917, to the French Ambassador in Petrograd: "The boundaries of Alsace-Lorraine will be extended at least"—this is after the war, you understand, they are dividing up Alsace-Lorraine (Laughter)—"the boundaries will be extended at least to the limits of the former principality of Lorraine, and will be fixed under the direction of the French government." How? "At the same time, strategic demands must be taken into consideration, so as to include within the French territory the whole of the industrial iron basin of Lorraine, and the whole of the industrial coal basin of the Valley of the Saar." Alsace-Lorraine—iron and coal! Do you see (Laughter.) That is what they are interested in. Read Fred Howe's book on the war. Read J. A. Hobson's "Imperialism." The same stuff is in there, except that it was not official as it is here.

When Bankers Met

Finally, September 17, 1917, from the fourth to the seventeenth, in Switzerland, in Berne, "Jacques Stern, from the Netherland Bank of Paris—a Frenchman, Tuchman, from the Paris branch of the Lloyd Bank,—Furstenberg, Director of the German-Deutsche Bank," and a Director of the Austrian "Austro Bank". "Although the English denied that they participated in the consultations, however, on the second of September, Head-Director Bell of the Lloyd Bank, arrived here from London under the pretext of establishing a branch in Switzerland." German financiers, French financiers, English financiers, getting together last September, while the boys were dying in the trenches—enemies getting together, and dividing up—and the next message shows how they divided up the various interests involved. You could not in England or America—you could hardly mention a German without being suspected of something! Here world financiers sat down around the table, and talking it over, during a war! Now you talk about the economic basis of these things. The Bolsheviks have done more to hold up our hands in that contention than anybody else in the world, because they have just told us the truth. (Applause.)

Furthermore, in Russia, they are doing what must be done—laying the economic foundations of democracy, and

Program and Resolutions of the Lab

The program proper adopted by the National Conference of Representatives and Members of the Labor Socialist and radical movements of the United States in itself constitutes a world platform for democracy and peace. It has been amplified, however, by various resolutions adopted by the conference.

The program and resolutions follow:

INTRODUCTION

The people of the world want democracy and peace. From Russia, from England, from Italy, from Austria, from Germany, sounds the cry, "Peace, democracy and bread."

The people are tired of secrecy and oppression; they are weary of imperialism, privilege and exploitation. They speak with many tongues and present varying plans, but underlying all of them are the ideals of peace and democracy.

We, as members of labor, Socialist and radical organizations throughout the United States echo this demand for democracy and peace. We wish to make unmistakably plain our conviction that certain principles must underlie any successful program for world peace and democracy.

THE PROGRAM

1. Economic Freedom

Economic opportunities should be open to all and on equal terms.

a. All international waterways should be open at all times, under international guarantee.

b. Free Trade should prevail.

c. The ownership and control of all resources, public utilities, financial agencies and other economic opportunities should be vested in the people and their use open to all nations upon equal terms.

d. No nation should be responsible for the investments of its citizens in any other country.

e. No restrictions should be placed upon voluntary migration.

thereby laying the foundations for the destruction of economic imperialism. You cannot have special privilege at home, and democracy abroad. You cannot have economic rights one place, and economic wrongs in another. It is all interwoven and interworking nowadays, and if we begin to destroy special privilege, we have got to go right to

the bottom of it, and they are going to the bottom of it in Europe—in Russia. They actually propose to have all the industries in the hands of the Russian people, so that they will be managing their own affairs. (Applause.) That is what they are doing—striking at the root—that is, the economic root of the difficulty—striking right at the

base of the thing, trying to make it effective.

The emergence of the Russian people marks an epoch in the history of the world, whether they succeed or fail. They are holding up the light to us. Their experience must convince us—unworthy descendants of great lovers of liberty—that liberty lives only where

2. Political Liberty

The right of self-determination should be guaranteed to all peoples including those in dependencies and colonies.

3. Civil Liberty

Civil liberty, including freedom of conscience, of speech, of the press, of language, of assemblage and of petition should be absolute in time of peace or war.

4. Disarmament

a. All standing armies should be disbanded and all existing navies abolished.

b. Every form of military training and military service should be abandoned.

c. The production of all forms of munitions or instruments of war should be forbidden either in private factories or public establishments.

5. International Administration

These principles of world organization should be defined, promulgated and executed through an international assembly.

a. The international administration should consist of one body or chamber, composed of representatives elected within the several nations or groups by equal secret suffrage. This body should have full power to exercise or delegate authority.

b. Full provision should be made for the use of the initiative, referendum and recall in connection with every phase of the international administration.

c. For the purpose of constituting the international assembly a world congress should assemble at the conclusion of hostilities. In this congress all participants should be representatives of the people, so elected as to give proportional representation to substantial minorities.

d. All diplomatic affairs should be carried on in

Labor, Socialist and Radical Conference

the open and should be subject to parliamentary and popular discussion and control.

e. All existing secret treaties should be declared void.

RESOLUTIONS

Representation at Peace Conference

RESOLVED, That the members of this National Conference of Labor, Socialist, and Radical Movements assembled in New York City on February 16th, 1918, greet with enthusiasm the fact that President Wilson has placed as the first condition of his peace program "open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind." The members of this Conference demand, then, that in the peace settlement at the end of this war there be no secret diplomacy and that the governments be represented, not by diplomats working for the rival interests of the different nations, but by representatives chosen on a democratic basis having in mind the common international interests of the people throughout the world. Those representatives should be so chosen that the interests of the working classes in all the countries may be fairly and proportionately represented, so that they may be not merely statesmen acting for the people, but representatives of the people, chosen by the people.

Address to the People of America

RESOLVED, That Dr. Scott Nearing be asked to draw up the substance of his opening remarks as the preamble to the program of the conference.

Address to the Liberals of Germany

RESOLVED, That a committee consisting of Dr. Scott Nearing, Mr. Louis P. Lochner and Prof. Emily G. Balch be authorized to draw up an address to those forces in Germany which are making for a democratic peace, calling upon them to endeavor to prevent their government from destroying the work of the Russian revolution.

the people resolve that liberty shall be, and that the only way to preserve liberty is to preserve it, and the only people who can preserve it are the people. That is all. That is the story—simple, plain—that is the story of Russia. Neither in constitutions, dynasties, administrations—neither in institutions, nor individuals does liberty lie.

It lies in the hearts of the people, and when you get enough understanding of life into the people, you can have liberty. (Applause.) They seem to have done it. They seem to have done it in Russia. They seem to have fallen down pretty badly on the job in the United States. And so, by way of conclusion, I should say that the thing for us to do

Woman Suffrage

RESOLVED, That the conference endorse unqualifiedly the principle of woman suffrage co-equal with man suffrage and that we urge upon the delegates immediate effort in their own states to ensure the speedy passage in the United States of the woman suffrage amendment.

Representation in Peace Conference

In order to ensure representation of the best interests of democracy at the peace table, we recommend that the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Conference enforce on the Allied parliaments a demand for the election by proportional representation of their peace plenipotentiaries and that, further, proportional representation on the Peace Commission of all citizens be the end aimed at, with as much similarity as possible in the rules of election for all countries as is practicable.

Call for Peace Conference

Inasmuch as President Wilson, as well as the heads of other governments have already stated the basis for the opening of peace negotiations and since President Wilson has declared that such negotiations should be open, therefore be it, Resolved (a) That all existing bars to the full discussion of peace terms by the peoples of different countries be now removed; (b) That the peoples of the different countries should at once proceed to elect their representatives for the peace conference; (c) That as soon as an armistice is agreed upon between the belligerents, traveling to and from the place where the peace conference is to be held be unhindered.

Political Prisoners

RESOLVED, That this conference urges that upon the declaration of peace or the beginning of peace negotiations, all political prisoners in America and elsewhere should be granted a general amnesty.

is to follow humbly in the steps of the Russian people. Stop blowing about ourselves, and begin a little of the humble following—a little humility now, a little less self-pride. We have a leader now. We are not in the van any more. We have got to get America about-faced.

RULERS SEALED THEIR DOOM—HILLQUIT

In no other gathering ever held in New York City—a world metropolis where world history is made—have there been made so many significant addresses, perhaps, as in the National Conference of Representatives and Members of Labor, Socialist and other Radical movements.

Each of the addresses, and there were a dozen exceptionally notable ones in the course of the conference proper, the mass meeting and the International dinner, is worth reprinting in full, is worth study as a text for workers in the democacy and peace movement.

Although the Bulletin has been trebled in size, it can accommodate only a few of the speeches and these only in excerpt. The address of Morris Hillquit at the mass meeting is one of those which is particularly worthy of attention, but owing to the inexorable limitations of space has to be given to the reader only in part. It follows:

When the rulers of Europe unchained the furies of this world war, they dreamed little of the fact that they were sealing their own doom. For after all, in declaring this war, they have given an impetus to world forces, the existence of which was beyond their ken. Every year and every day that this war proceeds, makes it clearer and clearer that the great deep significance of the war is no longer the war itself—no longer the military aspects of the war—questions of battles, of victories, of defeats or even of rearrangements of boundaries after the war, but this war has started a social upheaval, the like of which the world has never seen. Whatever may be the strategic or the military outcome of this war, whichever side may win eventually,—and I am fully inclined to agree with Mr. Pinchot that in a military sense, there will be no decisive general victory,—but whatever turn it should take, one thing is absolutely certain to the minds of all thinking men and women today. *The world will never return to conditions such as they existed before the war.* (Loud applause.) *When this war is over, and it will not be very long, a new world will be created—a new world will be built and that world will be a people's world instead of a ruler's world.* (Applause.)

There are many and many reasons for it, and there are many interesting and definite symptoms of it. This tremendous cataclysm has brought out all through the world, in every nation, entirely new forces.

The people of every nation, finding themselves in the face of a national crisis, in the face of a danger such as never before had confronted them, discarded suddenly, instinctively, impulsively, all the international prejudices and traditions of the artificial barriers that had separated group from group and class from class, in the face of the almighty death. They became leveled, they became equalized. They again became men and women, and just that. The new institutions which they have created—the economic institutions of collectivism, of community life, have come

to stay. Never again will any power on earth be able to persuade the millions of the toilers of all countries of the world, that they are an inferior class—a class born to carry the burdens of the universe, and to have none of its blessings—(applause) a class born to be slaves to a small patrician class of aristocrats and rulers.

The world democracy is awakening, not through a military, physical defeat of a militarist or autocratic regime, here or there. Oh no! Democracy is awakening in the people themselves, regardless entirely of victories or defeat on the battlefield. (Applause.) And then again, the rulers of the universe in this war have amply, conclusively, eternally demonstrated their unfitness to rule the world! (Applause.) Bear in mind that prior to the outbreak of the war, there was a feeling of growing revolt among the peoples of almost every country. There were ten million Socialist Voters in Europe alone. There were about thirty or forty million men and women enlisted under the banner of revolutionary Socialism from one end of Europe to the other. German autocracy—German militarism, the German ruling class had but a short lease on life in 1914. One-third of the people had already declared itself against it in most emphatic terms at the ballot box. It was a question of perhaps a few more years, of perhaps two more general elections, and the ruling class of Germany was bound to be swept from power. And the same menace was there—was growing in every country of Europe—in Austria, in France, aye! even in Russia,—we had strike after strike, revolt after revolt before the war. *And I should not be surprised at all if the decision to throw the world into the war was partly made—at any rate largely influenced by the hope of the ruling classes that—by such a catastrophe, by an appeal to general patriotism by an appeal to the animal instincts of the people they might drown this storm of the coming revolution in their own countries.* (Loud applause.)

Well, they succeeded for a very short time. They managed to intoxicate their peoples with mutual fear and distrust for a short time. They managed to divert the course of social progress and social revolt for a time. But as the war wore on, as the victims of the war multiplied, as the sufferings increased, as the naked ugliness of actual warfare, of actual mutual destruction and annihilation became clearer from day to day, the peoples of all the countries at war began gradually to sober up.

War enthusiasm, war panic gave way to sober reflection and to reason, and gradually but steadily the forces of opposition to the war, the forces of peace, the forces of reason, the forces of social justice and sense, grew and increased in every country. In the month of December, 1914, several months after the beginning of the war, there was but one man in all of the German empire who had the courage, the heroism to stand up in opposition to the entire militaristic ruling class of his country against the war. (Loud applause.) His name, the name of Carl Liebknecht, will never be forgotten (loud applause) in history! And

with every succeeding test, the strength, the conviction that moved Liebknecht to the deed of heroism grew and grew. Next time it was two—Liebknecht and Rohde—and next time it was 20, with 22 others failing to vote in favor of war credits. Today it is safe to say that all of the German people—Socialists and workers—are opposed to war and for peace and for justice. (Loud applause.) Between the majority and minority factions of German Socialism, there is today but a question of degree of intensity and revolutionary conviction, but at the bottom, they are all openly, avowedly combatting the imperialistic, the annexationist designs of their government in Germany. (Applause.)

And so likewise in Austria, where the ruling classes are being driven to a conciliatory attitude. We are commenting upon the difference in tone between the speeches of Czernin and Hertling and our naive statesmen and our naive newspapers see in it a difference of personal temperament. Mr. Czernin happens to be a more polite gentleman than Mr. Hertling—more suave, perhaps a little kinder hearted. Oh cannot they see the plain and simple truth of the matter—that the strikes which took place in Austria just a short time ago, and which were political in their character and which were strikes against the war, and which have been allayed only temporarily upon the promise of the Government to make a just and democratic peace—can't they see that?—and the working class behind it, and the threatening working class revolt? That is what makes Mr. Czernin and the Austrian government more reasonable today! (Loud applause.)

On the other side, the workers of France, the workers of Italy are becoming daily more decided, more determined in favor of cessation of the slaughter of their own fellow workers of other lands, in the determination to force a speedy, democratic peace.

War has done for English labor what no amount of Socialist agitation and propaganda has been able to do. It has opened their eyes. It has opened their minds. It has made them forward-looking, progressive, radical. It has placed them at the vanguard of the labor movement of the world.

One of the most important historical documents produced in this war is the declaration of the peace program of the British Trade Union movement and Labor Party, adopted last December. Those of you who are not familiar with it, I can only advise to study it—study it until you know it by heart, for it represents the philosophy of a new and coming order. You may summarize it briefly. It is a picture of a new world—a world belonging to the world, the globe belonging to all mankind; a world without boxes—a world free to the inhabitants of the world to make the best of it, to make their lives on it; a world whose oceans and firmament are alike free and accessible to all people and all races and nations; a world which is based first of all upon the right of the people in every separate country to make their own lives, to enjoy the fruit of their own labor, to be equal, to be free, and then based upon the right of every group of people, of every nation, of every race to live free from any subjection, free from any domination by any other race, or any other nation. Instead of the present world of rulers and ruled—instead of the present world basis of strife and struggle within each nation and among nations, the English Labor Party holds out to us, as a definite, concrete peace program, for which, and for which alone, they and the workers of all countries will fight during this war, after this war, fight until it is attained, a world of brotherhood and reason! (Loud and prolonged applause.)

As the climax of this growth of democracy came the greatest ray of light to all mankind from the most unexpected place—Russia. (Applause.) It will take generations perhaps before mankind will fully appreciate what Russia has meant to human pro-

WORK FOR A JUST WAR TAXATION

I have been working as the head of a small organization for almost a year now, trying to persuade our friends down in Congress that rich people ought to be taxed to pay the cost of this war. We have a few converts in Congress. Some of the men there have made courageous and splendid fights to put into effect in the United States the British system of war taxation.

But, so far, their efforts have been unavailing, and Congress has passed a grossly unjust revenue bill that practically exempts the great proprietors from taxation. I say, practically. I mean comparatively.

Some time ago, I had compiled, by statisticians, figures in regard to the war profits of these corporations, and we found that in the first year of the war, the American war profit corporations will make over and above the average which they made in the three years preceding the war,

about three billions, six hundred millions, at the lowest figure, and three billion, six hundred million dollars is a trifle more than the whole money cost of the entire Civil War.

These are the patriotic gentlemen who are co-operating in many instances with the government of the United States, in mobilizing our industries. At this time to bring pressure upon Congress, we should all carry on a vigorous correspondence with our Congressmen and Senators.

Write a letter. Ask your Congressman and Senator if he will openly pledge himself to an 80% war profit tax, and to an income tax that will be at least as large as the present English basis.

—Amos Pinchot, at the Central Opera House Mass Meeting.

gress within the last year. Beginning as a nation which was always unjustly considered as the fort of reaction—of international reaction—the support of all remnants of feudalism—the support of autocracy—the support of militarism in all lands—the great mass of Russian people, children of nature, simple minded, untutored, unsophisticated peasants for the most part, rose with elemental strength to hurl a defiance at the mismanagement of the so-called civilized world all around them, and served notice upon their own masters—they served notice upon the ruling classes of all countries around them—that they, as far as it lies within their power, will see to it that international exploitation and international wars and international murder and international insanity shall cease and the world and the people of the world shall come to their senses again! (Loud applause.)

They turned to us—their sister democracies. They turned to the United States. They turned to France. They turned to England. And they said: "Let us together start building that new civilization. Let us forget the old dark days of old barbarism. Help us end this war. Help us make a democratic, general peace." And our Allies and the statesmen and rulers of Russia's Allies—shortsighted pygmies, tied by conventions and traditions of diplomacy, utterly unable to appreciate by conventions and traditions of diplomacy, utterly unable to appreciate that new giant born into the world, held them back with trite, diplomatic phrases. "Fight on! Fight on for a little while! Fight on until such time as we crush German imperialism! Then, and then only, will the world be safe for democracy." And they fought.

They were cornered. They were alone. They fought or they tried to fight. They suffered. They starved. They underwent inhuman privations. And again they besought their Allies to come to their aid, to help them, to help themselves, to help the world! And again the same phrases. And again they fought on, and they fought until they could fight no longer, and then they stopped fighting! And then they turned to all of us and they said:

"We have done our best. We have done all that human beings can be called upon to do, in order not to play a selfish, separate part in this great world drama. We did not want happiness and reason for us alone. We wanted it for the entire world. We have been begging you to come with us. You have not listened to us. We are left by you to our own resources. We will do what we can with our own resources. Only one thing is clear. We are determined grimly and unto death, first that there shall no longer be exploitation in Russia, and that there shall no longer be international murder as far as we are concerned!" (Hurrah! Loud and prolonged applause.)

It is interesting in this connection to compare the action of two governments. We have absolutely irresponsible immoral Bolsheviks of Russia on the one hand, and the very temperate, reasonable, rational respectable Ukrainian government of which our capitalist press makes so much. (Laughter.) The latter, dominated for the time being by a government of moderates and bourgeois or semi-bourgeois, has consented to most shameful bargains.

It has said to the German imperialist government: "So long as you give us a strip of land, stolen from another country—from Poland—so long as you divide your plunder with us, and so long as you give us a big loan of money and guarantee our prosperity, we are ready to supply you with food so as to enable you to continue the slaughter of the other peoples." And the Russian revolutionists—these international outcasts—they have said: "Never! So long as we breathe and no matter how deeply, how intensely we suffer, will we give you a lending hand to help you in your international slaughters any longer!" (Applause.) But let me tell you—the German Government—Imperial Government of Germany is figuring without the host. The Ukrainian peasant is a scrap of paper. There are Bolsheviks in Ukraine too! (Hurrah! Loud and prolonged applause.) The German Government will have to face a hornet's nest in Ukraine. It will have to face the revolutionary government of Russia, and with another attempt to invade Russia

it will have to face, and that will probably be the decisive factor—an absolute repetition of Russian history on German soil! (Hurrah! Loud applause.)

You may say that the first attempts at revolt of the German people have been suppressed and their strikes broken. True. But so had they in Russia immediately before the outbreak of the war! You may say Prussian militarism and Prussian autocracy are strong. So were they in Russia, before March of 1917. No matter how strong the autocracy of a country may be, no matter how strong its military institutions may be, when the people of the country, peasants and the workers under arms, and those who are not under arms, their brothers, are in revolt, then autocracy and militarism will see their last hour sooner or later, and I hope—I trust—I believe German autocracy will have to wait very little longer! (Loud and prolonged applause.)

ANOTHER LIE NAILED

In spite of the desperate effort to suppress news of the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist conference, and the effort to discredit our own national Labor, Socialist and Radical conference, news will slip through. The following is from the New York Times:

London, Feb. 22.—Emil Vandervelde, representing the Belgian Labor party, presided at the continuation of the conference of the Labor and Socialist parties of the Entente allied countries to-day. M. Vandervelde said there were two great questions before the conference, namely, the elaboration of a common programme and the calling of a general international conference. On the first question agreement had virtually been reached, the speaker said. He added:

"The American Federation of Labor is the only party to the contract that is lacking. Its adhesion is indispensable, and measures must be taken to insure it."

DR. MAGNES PREDICTS PEACE MESSAGE

No address at the mass meeting was more significant nor more eloquent than that of Dr. Judah L. Magnes, whose courageous utterances and counsel have made him one of the leaders of the international democracy and peace movements in the United States, as they had in more peaceful times made him a distinguished influence in American thought and ideals.

It is to be hoped that the address of Dr. Magnes, which suffers severely from the elimination of important paragraphs, may with those of other notable speakers at the conference, be published in unabridged form. For the present, however, it is possible to present only parts of it.

A particularly significant part of the address is that showing the manner in which the administration at Washington has indorsed one by one, many of the principles and contentions of The People's Council. Excerpts from the address follow:

The president of the United States is within a very short time to issue a memorandum or a message, or an address, the burden of which will be nothing less than this,—a call to all of the belligerents to conclude an immediate peace. (Yea! Loud applause.) I believe that we have some right to anticipate what the president of the United States is to say.

Last May we came together, and were branded, as you all know, because we presumed at that time to anticipate in May what the President of the United States was going to say in December. (Applause.) At the end of May, we called out to the American people that it was their duty to impress upon their government the necessity of adopting as our own the Russian formula of no forcible annexations, no punitive indemnities, self-determination for all nationalities. On December 4, 1917, the president of the United States made that declaration himself.

At the end of May, we also proposed that the Government of the United States issue passports, to men who had been chosen to attend the International Socialist Conference at Stockholm. (Applause.) I venture to predict that although those passports were refused those men then, the passport will not now be refused to our delegate Mr. Maurer. (Loud applause.) The reason is simply this, that the people of the United States have begun to understand that the heavy hand of American autocracy, that the threats of the American black hundreds, that all of the oppression of American imperialism and militarism are not sufficient to keep the people down, but that the people, fearless of the consequences to themselves, are marching on until they shall take into their own hands what their rulers have taken from them. (Applause.)

On July 19, 1917, the German Reichstag majority parties passed a resolution, the text of which I have here. They said: "The Reichstag labors for peace, and a mutual understanding, and lasting

reconciliation among the nations. Forced acquisitions of territory, and political, economic and financial violations are incompatible with such a peace. The Reichstag rejects all plans aiming at an economic blockade, and the stirring up of enmity among the peoples after the war. The freedom of the seas must be assured. Only an economic peace can prepare the ground for the friendly association of the peoples. The Reichstag will energetically promote the creation of international juridical organizations." This resolution was carried by a vote of 214 to 116. It was adopted on January 19, 1917. And immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, a committee of the People's Council petitioned the State Department to permit them to transmit to the Reichstag majority a message of congratulation, and a call to future activity. But some great scholar in the State Department, after three weeks search, discovered that a law had been passed, I believe in 1786. (Laughter) forbidding the transmission of any such telegram as that.

When the People's Council met in Chicago, September first—on August 31st and September 1st—two days after President Wilson had answered an appeal of the Pope for a Christian peace, when the People's Council there again emphasized the importance, the international significance of the Reichstag peace majority, the People's Council was driven from pillar to post, and was branded as common criminals might be branded. (Voice: "Shame!") Yet, on January 8, 1918, over almost six months after the Reichstag resolution was adopted, for the first time, the President of the United States mentioned this resolution, and asked the question: "For whom are the German negotiators, at Brest Litovsk, speaking? Are they speaking for the military masters of Germany, or are they speaking for the Reichstag majority?" Once again, on February 11, a few days ago, the President puts the same question to Count Von Hertling, and Count Czernin.

"For whom do you speak? Do you speak in the spirit of the military imperialists, or in the spirit of the Reichstag majority resolution?" More than that, when the Bolshevik revolution was successful, of course, Trotsky and Lenin were compared, much to our glory, with those seditionists of the People's Council in America. (Laughter and applause.) But it did not take long—in fact, something over two months after the People's Council rejoiced in the overthrow of the coalition in Russia, and in the victory of the Bolsheviks, until the President of the United States uttered those beautiful and truly moving words about the real spirit animating the Revolutionists of Russia.

Am I not therefore justified in anticipating once again what perhaps the President of the United States, in the fullness of his wisdom may in a very short time be tempted to say?

He is going to say what I said at the beginning. He is going to invite all of the belligerents to a peace conference for an immediate peace. (Applause.) And he is going to do it inssofar as at present I can see upon this simple basis—no forcible annexations—no punitive indemnities—the free development, self-determination, for all peoples, and nationalities. (Applause.)

Now let me be just a bit plainer as to the first of these stipulations—no forcible annexations. Just to think of it, brothers

and sisters, men and women of flesh and blood, who have their sons at the front, their daughters suffering, their wives and mothers in mourning—just to think of it. This war has reduced itself now to these sordid questions of territory. All questions of democracy are in the background. Questions of indemnity are no longer heard of. The things that they talk of are questions of land, of territory they ask: "What is the territorial solution of the war?" Count Czernin says "It must be the integrity of our dominion." Count Hertling says, "It must be the integrity of our dominions." Some of the allies say, "It must be a lopping off of dominions here and there." It is a question as to how these various territorial claims are to be adjusted.

Now, mark me. The President will call the peace conference upon a very simple territorial basis. There is only one possible territorial basis that can put an end to the war. It is what is known in the Russian parlance as "no forcible annexations" or in the parlance of diplomacy, as the "territorial status quo ante bellum." (Applause.) "Territorial status quo ante bellum" means that the only possible way of settling these territorial disputes is that the territories shall be—all of them, without any exception whatsoever, in the hands they were before the war broke out. (Applause.) Now, you cannot settle it in any other way. Germany and the Central Powers will fight for a generation just as the Allies will fight for a generation if the attempt be made by one side or the other to deprive either of a foot of their territories as they were before the war, and the war cannot be fought for a generation. The war cannot go on for another two years because with this war going on for another two years, the nations of Europe will be bankrupt in the first place, and their manhood will be destroyed. The people of Europe will not permit this war to go on for two years more. (Applause.) And because they will not—because they will not permit it to go on, it is now the task and the function of the governments at war to try to find the basis of this territorial peace.

Why must a conference for an immediate peace be called soon. It must be called soon because military decisions cannot be had in this war. It must be called now because democracy cannot be dictated by force of arms. (Applause.) An immediate peace must be called now from the point of view of the workers and the revolutionaries of the world for this reason.

Let us assume that peace is here, that the territories are once again in the hands of the nations that owned them before the war. What is then the situation? Is it not your purpose, and is it not my purpose, and is it not the purpose of all the down-trodden and all the workers of all the democratic forces, of all the revolutionary powers—is it not their purpose immediately, when the war is at an end, to put an end under peace to all of this oppression, which they cannot put an end to in the war? (Loud applause.) It is only in peace that your revolution has a chance, because if the war is to go on for another two years, the young red blood of the world will be spilled upon the thirsty battlefields. The young red blood—the young courage that makes revolution will be gone. . . .

But let no ruler mistake what this means. If we return to the territorial status quo, the world will never return to the spiritual status quo. (Applause.) If the boundary lines are put here or there, what great difference will that make if there be this great international revolution which Trotsky and Lenin, which the Bolsheviks (Loud applause)—not only of Russia, but of America (applause)—of Germany (applause)—of England, of France, of Italy—let us hope, some day, of Japan (applause)—of China (applause) of India,—black peoples, white peoples, (applause), Jews (applause), Christians (applause), Mohammedans (applause), Hindoos (applause), those in Africa, in Asia, in Europe, in the Americas, and on the Islands of the Seven Seas—all of them meeting in a different dimension from the dimension in which men meet now—meet-

BIG BUSINESS THE TRAITOR, SAYS MAURER

After pledging himself to carry out the will of the conference, James H. Maurer, addressing the mass meeting in Central Opera House, Sunday afternoon, February 17, launched a terrific indictment of Big Business, particularly of the railway interests. The main parts of his address follow:

We hear a great deal about the traitors in this country, and that is the point I want to talk about. There are traitors in this country, and I want to point them out to you this afternoon. I am not merely going to discuss the subject of why we went into the war, or anything about it. We are in it. It is no use talking about that part of it.

Since we are in this war, this government needs soldiers. It can today lay its hands on ten million able-bodied men. But when it has these men, it needs more than just men. The government needs not only men, but transportation, food, equipment.

If you were an enemy to this government, and you wished to cripple its efforts in the prosecution of the war, what would you do? Would you go around here talking ugly about the government? No—I don't think you would. If you were an intelligent man, you would not. Would you go around and see whether you could get somebody on strike? Certainly not. It would not amount to anything. But if you could cripple the entire industry of a nation, that would be doing something as a real enemy to the nation. And those are the gentlemen I am going to talk about.

The government, before it can use a million men, needs ships, and then must transport the goods on the ships, to provide for its million men abroad. It will need clothing, food, ammunition. *We find a force at work in this country to prevent the government carrying out that part of its program. I am going to ask you who in your opinion is the greatest traitor to any nation—I care not which nation—the poor fellow who may unload his sincere thought, and in doing so, speak disrespectfully of the government that he is living under, or the man who will deliberately allow a very much needed locomotive to stand in the open and freeze up and be put out of commission? I think you will agree that the man who lets the locomotive freeze up.*

Who are the people responsible for the coal shortage—responsible for the

ing across boundary lines, meeting beyond territories, meeting because they are devoted to a pure idea, because they are devoted to things of the spirit, for that is only the pure idea—the ideal, the spiritual force, that can overcome that materialism which in Prussia is known as militarism, which in America is known as capitalism. (loud applause), which in England is known as the aristocracy (applause), which in France is known as imperialism. This materialism with all of its hissing mouths, with all its poisonous tongues, can only be crushed under the heel of a young people, of young workers, who have faith—who have belief in the potency in the efficiency of ideas, of ideals of spiritual aspirations. (Hurrah! Loud applause.)

chaos in our food transportation? The people who are day after day, from the housetops, declaring their patriotism, and branding anyone who complains against their management of industry, as traitors to the government. (Applause.)

The railroads have gone to pieces. Now, I am satisfied, and I want to be put on record as charging that the officials conducting our railroads are either managing them badly in order to discourage public ownership, and harass McAdoo, or else they are doing it to play directly into the hands of the imperial government of Germany, and it makes no difference which side they select and say they are guilty of.

The railroads have broken down. You suffer for coal. The people living almost against the coal mines were freezing, and they told you in New York papers, that the trouble was that the miners were not working steadily. The miners refused to work on Christmas and New Year's, they said.

I am going to tell you people the miners of western Pennsylvania are now, and have, all winter, only been able to work about half-time. The miners of eastern Pennsylvania, the anthracite field, while they are working pretty steadily, are not working full-handed—and why? Because the railroads failed to give them cars to load their coal, and failed to move the coal when the cars are loaded. We could furnish from Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Virginia fields all the coal that we need, without any trouble. But you did not get it.

Our miners are suffering because they are only allowed to make about half time. Millions of tons of coal scattered throughout our state on sidings, in storage, everywhere coal—not moving though! Is there a conspiracy, I ask you? Answer that question yourselves. Traitors, right amongst us! And these are the people that are constantly yelling "traitor" at those who point out the truth.

The other week, word came to us that they were going to discharge forty men in the Philadelphia Terminal of the Pennsylvania Road. We asked why. They said the men were not twenty-one years old, and the law of Pennsylvania compels their discharge. But the law of Pennsylvania says "18", not "21", and if we hadn't caught them, just as we did, there would have been forty experienced men discharged. Now, why? Why were they eager to discharge forty experienced men at the biggest terminal east of Chicago? Why? To harass, to interfere with traffic, and nothing else. Why did they send trains out, train after train, without even an extra piece of air hose on the train? This has gone on right along—and good locomotives have been standing on sidings, freezing up.

In the city where I live, the Reading Railroad has big locomotive shops, and yet it cannot supply itself with coal to keep its own locomotive shops a-working. Of course, you will say they could,

but they don't, and the employees are there, working a full day every day, getting paid whether they work or not. the machinery shut down on the plea that they have not the fuel to run the engines.

I say "traitors"! And you government reporters, and the Secret Service, report me correctly, and tell your superiors that Maurer said that if they want to find the real enemies of this government, to look upon the managers of the railroads at the present time.

In the city of Reading, and this is typical of the whole country east of the Mississippi, the iron workers, making supplies for Uncle Sam's ships, have only made eleven days' time since the tenth of last December. Why? No fuel, and the miners only making half-time in the bituminous fields. Can you conceive of the Kaiser, in all his hideousness, planning and scheming and delivering a more diabolical plot to harass this government in its work, than just such action on the part of the men who pose as America's real lily-white patriots? (Applause.)

OPEN LETTERS TO PROFITEERS

An Arraignment of Big Business in its Relations to the War. By Scott Nearing, Chairman of the People's Council, 138 West 13th St., New York City.

DO YOU BELIEVE IN DEMOCRACY AND PEACE?

If so, you belong in the People's Council of America. It stands for what you stand for—it is the great clearing-house for the liberal and radical peace and democracy movements of the day.

WE DEMAND:

1. Immediate negotiations looking toward an early democratic and permanent peacea people's peace.
2. The re-establishment of American liberties, free speech, free press, free assemblage, free conscience.
3. The preservation of economic rights, an American standard of living; safeguarded working conditions; industrial freedom and economic justice.

(Detach and mail to *The People's Council*, 138 West 13th St., New York City.)

I am with you on this program:

Name

Address

I enclose \$..... for the furtherance of this work.

BOLSHEVIKI APPEAL TO BRITISH LABOR

Blunt truth is seldom heard from the lips of ambassadors. There is, however, a new figure among ambassadors—Litvinoff, proletarian revolutionist, whom the Bolshevik government of Russia has named ambassador to London. Litvinoff, who was made ambassador while in an English prison, has issued on behalf of Russian labor this brutally truthful address to British labor:

"Comrades: The Russian People's and Peasants' Government has done me the honor of choosing me as its representative in this country, and has entrusted me in this critical moment of history with the task of interpreting the desires and aspirations of Russian revolutionary democracy, and of keeping it informed of those of British Democracy.

"To this end I consider it my first duty to put before you the real truth about the revolution, particularly in its bearing upon the war.

"Millions of men have been calmly doomed to death; whole countries to devastation; generations of workers, all the world over, to privation; and, at last, one may hope, the masses are going to profit by their bitter lessons. Bled to death, bereft of millions of its sons, brought to the very verge of starvation and utter misery, but enlightened by years of Socialist propaganda, and inured to revolution by former struggles, the proletariat of Russia suddenly arose, and with one stroke freed itself of its bonds, and with the battle-cries: Peace! Bread! Land! Liberty! overthrew its rulers and oppressors.

"Here I should like to point out that the motto of the March revolution was Peace! and not *Continuance of the War*, as some people in this country would like you to think. It was, of course, the secret desire of the middle-class parties involved in the revolution by doing their best to distort its character, to continue the war. But it was not *their* revolution, it was the revolution of the working-man and the peasant in mufti and in uniform.

"For ten months the working men have been the guardians of the revolution, by the widespread network of their

Soviets (Councils of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates) holding the real power in their hands, permeating the revolution with the social ideas of their class. Unfortunately, at first, some of their leaders were so ill-advised as to share the power with these middle-class politicians, who did everything they could to obstruct and arrest the further development of the revolution, to prevent the masses from realizing their political and social aims, and to force them to remain still involved in the war.

"Ostensibly standing for peace these politicians actually thwarted the peace movement by proceeding with the arrangements of secret diplomacy. They appealed to the proletariat of the Central Powers, but the obvious duplicity of their policy weakened their appeals, which met with little response, while at home their irresolute and wavering handling of the land question and other problems of the revolution caused disaffection and disillusion among the masses, and fed the counter-revolution and reaction.

"Alive to the dangers of the prolongation of the war and of counter-revolution, the workmen and soldiers of Petrograd, Moscow, and other towns found themselves compelled to break finally with the middle-classes, and to restore full power to the Soviets.

"And so the second revolution, the true proletarian revolution of November, was brought about, and a mighty class war began in Russia, which is now going on. This second outbreak showed the capitalists and their lower middle-class helpers a vision of its far-reaching possibilities, and now it is that they would move heaven and earth if they could to crush the victorious Russian proletariat. No means are too low for them to employ. They shrink from nothing, not even from the complete disorganization of the economic life of the country, not caring how much they add to the troubles already heaped on the people by four years of war.

"In the teeth of this bitter struggle the working men of Russia are creating new forms of state organization, carrying on

social reconstruction on a tremendous and lofty scale, providing homes for the homeless, introducing an eight-hour working day, giving land to the peasant, taking control over industry, nationalizing the banks and insurance companies, rebuilding the social structure in every direction. To reveal to the world the imperialistic nature of this war, the secret treaties have been published, and decisive steps have been taken to bring about a general, just, democratic peace. The Soviets are forcing the governments of all the belligerent countries to state clearly their war aims, thus opening the way for peace negotiations. By giving complete freedom to all the small nationalities of the Russian Empire they prove the unselfishness and sincerity of their treatment of the national or no annexation question.

"Their revolutionary propaganda among the German soldiers on the western front and among prisoners of war is undermining the strength of German autocracy and militarism more effectively than military victories could, and has already provoked a strong peace movement in Germany and Austria. But these endeavors meet with opposition not only from capitalists in Russia, but from capitalists all the world over. The Russian Revolution, with its dash and vigor, has become the focus of the hatred of international capitalism, and now the prolongation of the war, in addition to its former imperialistic aims, has another aim—to crush the Soviets and the Revolution.

"Realize this! The further prolongation of the war must lead to the defeat of the Russian Revolution and to the triumph of militarism and reaction everywhere. An immediate, just, democratic peace on the principle of *no annexations, no indemnities*, will spell the downfall of militarism in all countries. This peace can be achieved if only labor will speak in full voice and act with all its might. Workers of Britain, peace is in the balance! The Russian workers appeal to you to join them in their efforts to turn the scale. Labor—speak!"

PEOPLE'S COUNCIL OF AMERICA FOR DEMOCRACY AND PEACE

"Government of the people, by the people, for the people."

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

SCOTT NEARING, Chairman.
MORRIS HILQUIT, New York.
JAMES H. MAURER, Pa.
DR. GERTRUDE KELLY, New York.
DANIEL KIEFER, Del.
JACOB PANKEN, New York.
WILLIAM C. REMPFER, S. D.
GEORGE E. ROEWER, Mass.
REBECCA SHELLY, Mich.
WILLIAM SHORT, Cal.
HARRIETT PARK THOMAS, Ill.

LOUIS P. LOCHNER, Executive Sec'y.
ELIZABETH FREEMAN, Organizing Sec'y.

HELP SPREAD THE GOSPEL

THE PEOPLE'S COUNCIL has for FREE DISTRIBUTION a series of educational, historical and propaganda pamphlets, bearing upon present radical problems.

We want you to help distribute them. It may be that this is the most important service you can perform for the movement.

How many can you use to good advantage?

"Who Should Pay for the War?" by Scott Nearing.

"The Message of New Russia."

"Democracy and Peace."

"War—Who Gets the Profits?"

"Secret Diplomacy and Profiteering," with excerpts from the infamous secret treaties, exposed by Trotzky. (Complete copies of the secret treaties, as published by the New York Evening Post, 10 cents).

Write to ELIZABETH FREEMAN, Organizing Secretary

The People's Council of America, 138 West Thirteenth Street, New York City.